

State Libraries

WALTER T. BRAHM

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE in the United States has historically been the responsibility of local government and continues to remain so at the present writing.¹

Reading of the organic laws under which individual state library agencies operate leaves no doubt that most of the early ones came into being as institutional libraries to meet the needs of their state governments: governor, legislators, and state officials.² For example, a Michigan commission of inquiry proposed some years ago "that the functions of the state library be reduced to the original purpose of providing a library for the use of state officials."³ All state agencies today serve the legislative, administrative, and judicial officers of their state government, the only library function which can be found among all the states.⁴

Until late in the nineteenth century state governments had little concern for the development of library service other than for their own housekeeping needs. In fact, as late as 1936 the library profession was slow to acknowledge the role which state libraries were beginning to assume in the development of local library service. In a compilation of papers on library trends that same year, the role of state libraries was conspicuous by its absence.⁵ As late as 1941 Miles and Martin pointed out that "far from a proportionate share of attention has been devoted to state library problems by the library profession itself. . . . If present trends continue . . . the most extensive development in the library field during the next decades will take place in state library services."⁶ The services which the states were giving in 1940 had not yet loomed large enough to penetrate the consciousness of the library world's leaders. However, library leaders were involving the state in plans for library development, centering on the local library as an accomplished fact, with the state agency as an accessory to the fact. In 1935, Joeckel pointed out that no state had made library service

Mr. Brahm is Librarian, State Library of Ohio.

mandatory: "Unwilling or at least not yet ready to issue a positive mandate for universal library service, the states have turned their attention toward the more limited objective of stimulating the interest of local government in the establishment and maintenance of public libraries. In the accomplishment of this purpose, the states have worked through a variety of organizations, usually grouped under the generic name of 'library extension agencies' which are found today in forty-four states."⁷

Such state assistance to libraries was provided through numerous functions of the extension agency: establishment of libraries; grants in aid, or subsidies; advice and assistance; supervision or inspection; and, upon occasion, certification of personnel of public libraries. Perhaps the most successful of these functions was the establishment of libraries. Joeckel credits the number of public libraries in existence in 1935, 6000, largely to the efforts of the extension agencies and points out that perhaps in their zeal they created too many separate units with inadequate financial resources for library service.⁸

In 1935 some ten states were making direct contributions to individual public libraries, seldom exceeding \$100 to each library.⁹ By 1935 in the area of supervision and regulation only two states, New York and Wisconsin, had established certification for all professional members of library staffs.¹⁰ But beyond certification, the states had not ventured into the field of library supervision and regulation. Rather they sought to accomplish results by advice and persuasion. Joeckel believed that *in no case had any state sought actual management of local library service*.¹¹

Some fifteen years later, a survey¹² reported five library functions which were provided by the states with few exceptions. These functions were general library service to public or state officials, extension service, historical and archival service, legislative reference, and law library service. Using the above findings as a basis, in 1956 the National Association of State Libraries¹³ attempted to define the role of the state library. Holding that the state library is the focal point of, state-wide library services, it enumerated "the generally recognized components of an integrated state library agency":

1. *General library services.* Considered to include reference, research, and loan functions, with an efficient and reliable bibliographic service and interlibrary loan system; the collection, compilation, and publication of significant statistics from all of the libraries in a state;

State Libraries

the dissemination of information regarding regulations and legislation affecting libraries.

2. *Archives.* Considered a direct function of the state library, including responsibility for establishing a records management program and disposing of state records, also advising local governments on the management of their records.

3. *Government publications.* The collection and servicing of state, federal, and local government publications to meet their primary and original purpose, serving their own state officials.

4. *Law, legislative reference, and state history.* The responsibility for developing a law library as a center for legal reference and research to meet its own governmental needs. Legislative reference service; the collection, preservation, and servicing of materials relating to a state, its people and its history.

5. *Special services.* Many library services geared to particular aims of an individual state such as recruitment, placement, certification of library personnel, library services to state mental and correctional institutions, and services to the blind.

6. *Extension.* It is the extension function which has permitted the state library to bridge the gap between its institutional purpose and the local aspect of public library service. This function with its great potential stirred the imagination of state library personnel and the library profession and created considerable controversy between the profession and students of government.

The library extension movement as we know it today began with state legislation affecting rural library development.¹⁴ Such legislation dates back to 1869, when Vermont authorized libraries to contract for services. Connecticut authorized state grants in 1893. However, major legal provisions for extending library service to rural areas and for providing financial aid to make this extension possible are of comparatively recent date.

Less than a decade after the University of Chicago held its Library Trends Institute in 1936, library extension had become important enough for the University to hold a similar institute in 1944 devoted exclusively to this function. Joeckel keynoted its opening with a comment, "In the year 1944, a century after the beginning of the public library movement in this country, the extension of library service to all people is still a great unfinished task of American librarianship. It is perhaps fruitless to debate whether this particular task is greater than any of the others which confront librarians."¹⁵

Because the amount spent by state libraries for extension in the early history of such work has never been recorded, no comparison with current expenditures can be made. Even recent expenditures,¹⁶ estimated as \$5,601,437 for 1955-56, are not necessarily reliable since this figure excludes state grants. In addition, the fact that many states operate extension service as an integrated unit of their total library system makes it difficult to pinpoint the exact costs of this operation.

While grants-in-aid as a form of library extension had been made by only ten states prior to 1935, ten years later, nineteen states and one territory received this support.¹⁷ By 1961, twenty-seven states had programs of financial assistance to public libraries.¹⁸ As an indication of the extent to which state financial assistance has grown in the past twenty-five years, New York appropriated for 1960 approximately \$8,000,000, and Massachusetts appropriated \$1,768,000 beginning in 1961.¹⁹

Although public library service has been considered entirely a responsibility of local government, there are notable exceptions. A number of state libraries lend books directly to borrowers by mail. For some twenty-five years Delaware has supplied direct bookmobile service to two of the state's three counties. Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont have also provided a form of direct service.²⁰ Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and numerous other states operate or have operated regional branches or experiments.²¹ Some of these provide direct service to the public in unserved areas; others serve existing library units in the regions.

At mid-century Garceau²³ identified three broad categories of state policy toward the promotion of public library service: traveling libraries and small subsidies to local libraries, large promotional grants to reorganize local library service along county or multi-county lines, and an emerging pattern of regional offices or units of the state agency.

With the passage of the Library Services Act by the Congress in 1956, state libraries assumed the responsibility of administering federal funds for library service and of planning for the development and coordination of public library service within their states. The Act made a state agency which would promote the extension and improvement of library service a necessity in every state wishing to qualify for a grant. Utah, previously without such an agency, established one to take advantage of the federal funds.²² While the first five years of the Library Services Act have not yet been evaluated, the states followed pretty much these patterns in their use of the funds. Nearly all moved toward strengthening their own agency with additional staff

State Libraries

and facilities, consolidating services such as processing, and in some cases providing direct or local library service by means of regional branches or special centers.²⁴

Because of their strategic position as an arm of state government, the state agencies in 1960 stand as the key libraries controlling the gateway to future library development, an emerging role which has developed within the past thirty years. The importance of such a role in the library world is further emphasized by the recent grant of \$45,000 by the Carnegie Corporation for financing a study of the state agencies and for the establishment of standards for such libraries.²⁵

An increase in population would necessitate greater activity at all other levels of state government, which in turn would increase the service demands which state personnel would make. In the area of assistance to local libraries an increase in the population is more likely to have a secondary and delayed effect than a direct effect upon state library agencies. Unless an agency is giving direct service, an increase in population will first exert pressure upon local libraries. Until such libraries call for or are willing to accept state assistance the state library is not likely to be greatly affected. Paradoxically, a decrease in population could conceivably throw a greater load upon the state agency by creating marginal and submarginal library service areas.

In the past state library agencies have been concerned with problems of sparsely settled areas. If the population becomes even more concentrated in metropolitan areas, a corresponding shift of interest of state agencies from rural to urban library problems and solutions could be expected. It seems certain that each state agency will have both problems to face—increasing metropolitan population and declining nonurban areas.

Link and Hope²⁶ report that 94 per cent of all books are read by 50 per cent of the public and conclude: "Many factors induce people to read books but the underlying influence among all these seems to be formal education. The higher the education, the greater the frequency with which books are read."

Hauser and Taitel project the number of high school graduates in 1980 to be 95 million as compared with 70 million in 1970 and 52 million in 1960, an 80-85 per cent increase in twenty years.²⁷ At the same time the number of college graduates is expected to increase from 8 million in 1960 to 11 million in 1970 and 15 million in 1980, again 80-85 per cent increase.

Projections of the population in 1929 did not predict this reversal or the advent of a war which restored a migration trend. Similarly projections made in 1940 did not envision the population explosion of the 1950-60 decade. Therefore, present projections are subject to a great margin of error when extended for two decades.

Regardless of the direction population takes, responsibility of the state for library service will continue to increase. In whatever areas the population decides to settle, metropolitan or rural, the areas remain component parts of the state. The trend of population will increase the pressure for over-all planning and the coordination of library service units presently maintained by overlapping or intertwined local governments.

1. *State government, including its library agencies, may well anticipate a significant expansion in all of its various functions and agencies.* Modern living even in the event of a stable population and optimum distribution will require more, not less, state government. Nuclear energy, civil defense, transportation, highway safety, health, education, and welfare are creating demands for new or expanded government functions. The inevitable results are more state employees. In a study of the trend of government employment from 1896-1940, Fabricant²⁸ points out that every federal or state function pushes up government employment more rapidly than the national or state population grows. He also notes that over this forty-five year period "in not a single function of the federal government, the cities, or New York State (or other states of which we have record), was the number of workers actually reduced. In no other sector of the economy would we find every major division expanding." The Council of State Governments²⁹ reports that legislative action in 1959 was notable for expansion and improvement of state services in line with the growth of the population and public needs. The number of state employees rose from 804,000 in October, 1946, to 1,469,000 in October of 1958. A comparable increase in the next twelve years would bring the number of state employees to over 2 million in 1970, and near 2½ million by 1980. The demands for additional information, research, and library service from state library agencies will be staggering.

An increase in the number of bills introduced for legislative consideration would place a load on the legislative reference, archives, and government publications functions of a state library, to say

State Libraries

nothing of the general library services function and the reference and research aspects of its work load. In addition, numerous special library services geared to special aims of individual state agencies probably would be initiated.

2. *Such increase in state government activities and consequent library demands will result in a decentralization of the state's library services.* History would seem to support this contention. The report of the National Association of State Libraries³⁰ in 1953 showed the high degree of decentralization of state library agencies which already exists. At that time various functions of state library service were provided by 131 different libraries, library agencies, or administrative units in forty-three states. Indeed, decentralization may well continue with the creation of new state departments and agencies which for one reason or another find themselves widely separated because of geography or building location. For this, and other reasons of convenience, many may set up their own departmental libraries, with the result that a further fragmentation of state library services will occur.

Thus services and demands may increase, but the services will be provided by a multiplicity of different state units, in sharp contrast with policies and practices which the state agencies themselves recommend. However, human nature being what it is, combined with the necessity for personal and political compromise in governmental operation, leaves little hope of great strides in centralization of the states' library agencies in the next twenty years.

3. *The state libraries will assume only limited responsibilities for school library service.*

The appointment of a school library supervisor in every state is one of the goals of the school library profession, and the measure by which the state is judged to have accepted its responsibility for such service. Mahar³¹ reports that only half of the states have school library supervisors. It is interesting to note that only five of the states established such a position in the last ten years, indicating that progress has been slow in this area since 1950.³² The passage of federal aid to schools now pending in Congress could reverse this trend rapidly if such funds were to be earmarked or authorized for school libraries. Nevertheless, with few exceptions education is a fiercely guarded local operation and will remain so regardless of federal aid. The school library and librarian are isolated from state direction by local authority, in the form of the superintendent of schools, and by

state authority, in the department of education. Lines of force or cooperation cannot be transmitted directly from the state's library agency to the school library but must go up to the state superintendent, across to the local superintendent, and down to the school librarian.

In most states, responsibility for school library service has been considered the province of the state education agency rather than of the state library agency. In only fifteen states does the state library agency have legal responsibility for school libraries and the Council of Chief State School Officers speaking on this point has just recommended that "the full responsibility for state-level services to school libraries should be assumed by state departments of education."³³ The possibility is remote that state libraries could be given or could assume sufficient authority to have any effect upon the direction or coordination of school library service in the future. This does not mean that the state education agency or state library agency will not work closely with individual school libraries and their staffs, but such possible cooperation is not likely to be on any large or uniform scale.

4. *The state will become increasingly more active in the coordination and consolidation of public libraries into larger library units. Conversely, the legal basis of local library service will see little change in the next decades, the rapid development of "systems" and metropolitan areas to the contrary notwithstanding.*

Joeckel points out that it is largely the result of the efforts of extension agencies of state libraries that the number of public library administrative units in the United States reached a total of over 6,000 by 1930.³⁴ Today the number exceeds 8,000.³⁵ It is very likely that state libraries will devote a major part of their energy and activities in the next twenty years *attempting* to reverse this trend and to reduce the number of library administrative units. Consolidation of libraries into larger economic units is the goal sought. However, since "consolidation" is not a pleasant word to local librarians and their trustees, but one which stirs adverse public opinion, state efforts undoubtedly will be channeled in the direction of lesser resistance, that of coordinating libraries and their functions. Such coordination is more likely to take place by the mutual agreement (contract) of all concerned. This practice leaves the local administrative unit intact, giving the appearance of willingly subordinating itself to a larger group activity; yet it is still free to pick up its marbles and

State Libraries

go home should it not like the way the other boys are playing. A contract is an agreement, good only as long as those who made it are in agreement, whereas under consolidation, in the event of a disagreement, the majority makes the decision and consolidation remains.

There is evidence to show that state libraries have begun to reverse the trend from creation of administrative library units to "consolidation" or reduction of their number. As early as 1947, Ohio³⁶ prohibited the establishment of new libraries by cities, school districts, or townships. New libraries have to be operated as branches of existing libraries or as branches of a county-wide library system. From a high of 281 public libraries in existence at the time of the passage of the law, by 1959 the number had been reduced to 270. In 1960 the number was further reduced to 265 by the consolidation of a group of six small libraries in Preble County, Ohio.³⁷ But this is slow progress, averaging one reduction per year.

Other states have devoted a good deal of effort toward the same ends. They have used a variety of methods, most of which have employed the use of contract or other cooperative agreements. The Buffalo, Erie County, New York, federation of libraries is a good example.³⁸ Some twenty-six independent community libraries in Erie County surrounding the Buffalo Public Library agreed to operate as a library unit, although each library maintained its own administration along with the right to withdraw from the agreement at the sacrifice of some income. This federation, resulting primarily from local initiative, was aided by the New York State Library and served as a pattern for the State Library's later program of aid and organization of libraries in the state.

Activity of state libraries along these lines was greatly stimulated and the trend accelerated with funds provided by the Library Services Act. States used federal money as an incentive for such consolidations and were successful in occasional situations. Where they were unable to accomplish mergers with funds, they used them as an incentive for contract arrangements or cooperative services. Where contract arrangements were unable to effect joint administrative units, state agencies attempted to pull out certain functions, such as book purchasing, cataloging, film circuits, and use federal funds to establish cooperative contracts or agreements for these specific activities. As a result a considerable number of "regional" libraries have come into being in the past five years. The term "regional" covers a variety of sizes and types of organization, but for the most part their

existence is based upon contractual arrangements. No doubt in the next twenty years additional states will enact enabling legislation authorizing and encouraging regional libraries and library systems, but these too are likely to be on a contract basis.

Since contract arrangements and special service cooperatives are more palatable to local library officials as an alternative to complete consolidation, it seems to this writer that state libraries again are in danger of committing a mistake comparable to that of their predecessors of a generation ago in promoting the establishment of so many small libraries. It will be a mistake difficult to correct later if state librarians devote zeal and enthusiasm to the preservation of local units of library service by hiding them under a blanket of paper contracts and cooperative agreements, instead of promoting true consolidation on a larger unit basis. The latter would remove forever the possibility of returning to their former status, and prepare libraries for the goal of state-wide library service.

5. *In the next twenty years, state libraries will not confine their attention solely to public library organization, but will also become catalytic agents in coordinating and perfecting cooperation between college libraries and between college and public libraries in their states.* They will most surely be called upon to aid in meeting the library needs of the small colleges and in solving the complex problems of library service to large numbers of students who are making heavy demands upon both public libraries and their school libraries.

6. *State libraries will assume the leadership for integrating certain library functions on a state or regional basis, such as reference services, processing, and central storage of books.* A number of state agencies have already taken action in one or more of these areas: California, Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Ohio, and South Dakota. This is a vast area to be explored, and the great vacuum which now exists will surely draw the state agencies into it.

Supporting evidence for conclusions 5 and 6 above is even now available. In November, 1960, a committee³⁹ on reference and research library resources of New York's State Commissioner of Education recommended that the state establish a State Reference and Research Library Resources Board with a network of five regional reference and research library systems working closely with the state board to assist in the establishment and development of regional cooperative library programs for college and university students

State Libraries

and in the development of a cooperative program of library services for the professional and research community. This program aims primarily at libraries serving higher education and research, and attempts in the reference field to coordinate the library services of college and public libraries. In January, 1960, the State Library of Ohio⁴⁰ recommended a similar program to facilitate reference and research sources in metropolitan areas through the employment and placement (by the state) of skilled reference workers in these areas to answer research requests from anywhere in the state and to develop the bibliographic potential of the areas. Early in 1961 the Missouri State Library with the aid of federal funds opened a bibliographic center in the Springfield Public Library to speed up delivery of books and reference material to libraries in twenty counties of southwest Missouri.⁴¹

7. *The next twenty years may see a more definite, although not rapid trend toward the provision of direct service to residents of the state by state agencies.* In some cases the latter may operate library service by means of branches in communities or villages and administer certain functions, such as processing and special reference. The net result of such a trend may eventually, but certainly not in this 1960-80 period, see the demise of local responsibility for library service and in its place a state-wide and perhaps state-operated library system.

Library literature implies that direct provision of library service to residents of the state by the state has never existed and is not likely to. Joeckel⁴² points out that the state has never sought actual management over local library service. This statement, made in 1935, was true as far as the intent of the state was concerned, but even then in actual practice some states were giving direct service, either to residents of the state who would come in person to the state library, or by mail. State libraries of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont have been operating bookmobiles for many years, a most direct form of service.

There are many factors which point to the inevitable development of state-wide, state-operated library systems, however remote the possibility appears at the moment. Here listed and briefly discussed are the reasons for this belief:

a. *Demographic factors and the nature of man leave no other conclusion.* Big cities will become bigger. Small cities will become big cities. There will be more marriages, more children, more teen-agers,

more college graduates, more educated people who will want more culture, which means more interest in books and libraries. Twentieth-century American life has fluidity built-in. People may live in one community, earn their living in another, and send their children to school in a third, on the basis of what is most convenient for them and what they personally prefer. Daily the line between city, suburb, small town, and farm becomes less visible and has still less reason for existence. By 1980, the vast majority of Americans may have little patience with artificial boundary lines that create problems in their daily lives, instead of solving them.

Library patrons are also on the go, and want to use libraries on the basis of their personal convenience and preference. For these reasons library service must be administered on a much larger base than has been conceived up to now. The state is therefore the next logical step. However, it may be too big a step for local library officials to take in ten or twenty years, and the writer can envision an intermediate step as a distinct possibility—a Regional Library Authority. Encompassing a metropolitan area or a large area of the state, locally-collected library taxes would be converted to state-collected taxes and returned to the Regional Authority—a state agency—for the operation of library service in the entire region.

b. *State grants for library service will increase tremendously.* The number of states providing monetary grants in aid has more than doubled in the past twenty-five years. Coming at the very beginning of these next twenty years, the new and large appropriations of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Kentucky would seem to herald a trend toward great increases in state aid. Since larger systems are more efficient economically, the day must come when each state accepts that logic and asks why it is not applied to its own state funds.

c. *There will be a continuous expansion to ever-larger units.* The library serving a single county has long been the goal of the county library movement. Gretchen Schenk⁴³ points out that in many ways, especially in many of its problems, the library serving a single county is now the counterpart of the village library presently decried as inadequate; and that this has led librarians to the next development—multi-county or regional library service. Will not the regional library eventually also become such a counterpart? If so, the next logical development may be the state as the unit.

d. *State-wide registration—one library card good anywhere in the state—is a distinct possibility.* Ohio in 1960 began plans for the development of such a system. Massachusetts⁴⁴ as a condition of its

State Libraries

new state aid appropriation required local libraries "to extend privileges to the holders of cards issued by other public libraries in the state on a reciprocal basis." Michigan and Arkansas officials are studying the possibility of a state-wide card.

Such a development is a state-wide operation for that specific function and will have to be administered from a central point which logically would be the state library agency.

e. *Consolidation will be too little and too late.* Writing on the problems of metropolitan library service in 1960, Hamill⁴⁵ points out that while tremendous strides have taken place since 1936 in the improvement of transportation and communication, no progress can be reported in the improvement of the metropolitan hodge-podge of separate governmental units including libraries. In fact the situation has grown worse and continues in that direction. Eastlick,⁴⁶ working on the same problem, claims that one of the worst gaps in library service occurs in the suburbs of big cities, that state laws include no enabling legislation for a metropolitan library authority, and that legislatures are slow to recognize the need for such legislation and reluctant to adopt it. The standard recommendation to solve the dilemma is that the state provide funds to existing library units leaving them intact or decentralized—in other words increased state aid, as mentioned previously.

f. *Interrelated use of libraries may be a determinant.* It may be true as Eastlick states that one of the worst gaps in library service occurs in the suburbs of big cities; yet urban and metropolitan areas of the nation are glutted with libraries. Libraries are in elementary schools, high schools, colleges; public libraries and branches are in every city and many suburbs; most large businesses, banks, and industries have special libraries. A recent study⁴⁷ of libraries in the university area of Cleveland reported the existence of fifty libraries within one mile of Western Reserve University's main library.

There is no lack of libraries, but lack of coordination. The thundering herds of students are just beginning their stampede through the nation's libraries. The student in his quest for library service sees no difference in various types of library units—school, college, or public. If the public makes no distinction in its use of libraries between the various types of library service, inevitably someone must ask the question: Why then are they supported and administered separately? This query suggests the state as the logical agency for the coordination and eventual administration of library service.

g. *State finances are in better shape than local governments'.* The

latter face drastic economic problems. Local government debt increased tenfold in the first half of the century and exceeded 25 billion dollars in 1953. State debt, while also rising rapidly, was only 7½ billion. But state revenue increased significantly for that period and now exceeds that of local government.⁴⁸

h. *Federal funds will accelerate the trend to state provision of direct library service.* Existing federal funds are at present expended and administered by the state. Available since 1957, less than five years ago, they have already been used by a number of states to give direct service. In the future, with resistance to consolidation and with overlapping use of libraries by nonlocal residents, the state may find it easier to cross boundary lines and give direct service than to persuade local libraries to consolidate or patrons to restrict themselves to their own community library. For example, Ohio first offered federal funds to local library units to enable them to provide book-mobile service, but the local units did not want the administrative problems which went with the service. Where the service involved more than one county, the question of crossing boundary lines was also involved; so the State Library was requested to establish and operate the service with the localities providing a portion of the funds. The state did not seek this management, but acquired it because of local demand and because it was the only logical road through which library service could be provided.

Hobson, reporting on library service in Vermont, cites such a trend as a problem for the state agency in its efforts to resist it. "One of the great problems is to stimulate the public libraries to improve their services rather than to be satisfied by accepting all of the services offered by the state agency. This is a real problem in small communities where individuals or splinter groups insist upon trying to get their library services directly from the state agency instead of using their local library."⁴⁹

i. *Automation affects all.* Whatever success the application of machines to library processes such as storage and retrieval of information attains, the more will all libraries, small and large, school and public, need to be organized into some type of network if the full use of such automation is to be realized. Here again the state would seem to be the key agency in organizing and perfecting such a system.

8. *State libraries will have regulatory powers over public libraries.* Most state libraries today have little or no control over public li-

State Libraries

baries. Eastlick⁵⁰ warns that the state libraries need to be given regulatory powers because of the necessity for closer coordination of public library service. The factors enumerated above—the large number of libraries in some areas, their lack of coordination, the unwillingness of legislatures to establish metropolitan library authorities, increased state aid, the interrelated use of all libraries by the public—are likely to speed up the establishment of some type of state regulation.

9. *State libraries will be the planning center for library service, library legislation, and library standards throughout their respective states.* State libraries have been the center for developing library legislation for many years, but have been slow to enter the field of total library research.

Leigh, in specific reference to this function, pointed out the need for it and predicted it as a future trend: "as state libraries grow larger and more complex, especially as they take on the responsibility for public library development throughout a state, they need to develop consciously and systematically the intelligence function as part of their structure and on-going program."⁵¹ He believed that it would be necessary for the development of an intelligence function which would provide factual and other material as an aid in defining the library's purposes and policies and evaluate its operations. Such planning might range from brief observational staff studies to very specialized research studies.

10. *The state will become the focal point for library service.* The National Association of State Libraries in 1956 defined the role of the state library as the focal point of integrated library service.

The statement may not have been an accomplished fact at the time it was made. The previous predictions made in this article may be subject to errors of human observation and judgment. The curtain of the future is not transparent, but as time inexorably raises it, we shall most certainly find the state library ready to perform in a number of capacities—producer, director, actor, or stagehand, as the occasion may demand.

References

1. Leigh, R. D.: *Public Library in the United States*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1950, p. 110.
2. Foutts, J. C., ed.: *American Library Laws*. 2nd ed. Chicago, American Library Association, 1943.

WALTER T. BRAHM

3. Michigan. Commission of Inquiry into State Governmental Expenses: *Report*. Lansing, 1932, p. 16.
4. Leigh, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
5. Wilson, L. R., ed.: *Library Trends*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937.
6. Miles, A., and Martin, L.: *Public Administration and the Library*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941, p. 59.
7. Joeckel, C. B.: *Government of the American Public Library*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1935, p. 49.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
9. Wachtel, Lee: State Provisions for the Support of Municipal Public Libraries. *Library Quarterly*, 3:373-389, Oct., 1933.
10. Joeckel, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
12. National Association of State Libraries. Committee on Organization of State Library Agencies in the Structure of State Government: *Tentative Report*. Appendix p. 5.
13. National Association of State Libraries: *Role of the State Library*. [Columbus, Ohio, Stoneman Press, 1956].
14. Morin, W. L., and Cohen, N. M.: *State Library Extension Services*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, pp. 5-6.
15. Joeckel, C. B., ed.: *Library Extension Problems and Solutions*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1946, p. 9.
16. Morin, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
17. Joeckel, *Library Extension*, p. 198.
18. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *L.S.A. Memorandum No. 53*, June 1961, p. 2.
19. Moloney, F. X.: State Aid for Massachusetts. *Library Journal*, 85:4429-4431, Dec. 15, 1960.
20. Miles, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.
21. Garceau, O.: *Public Library in the Political Process*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1949, pp. 222-223.
22. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: State Plans Under the Library Services Act, Supplement 2. *Bulletin*, 1960, No. 27, p. 97.
23. Garceau, *op. cit.*, p. 214.
24. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
25. American Library Association. *Bulletin*, 54:709, Sept. 1960.
26. Link, H. C., and Hope, H. A.: *People and Books*. New York, Book Manufacturers' Institute, 1946, pp. 158-160.
27. Hauser, P. M., and Taitel, M.: Population Trends—Prologue to Library Development. *Library Trends*, 10:10-67, July 1961.
28. Fabricant, S.: Rising Trend of Government. *Occasional Paper 29*. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1949, p. 19.
29. Council of State Governments. *Book of the States*. Chicago, [no pub.] 1960-61, Vol. 13, p. 161.
30. National Association of State Libraries, *op. cit.*, Appendix p. 6.

State Libraries

31. Mahar, Mary H.: *State Department of Education Responsibilities for School Libraries*. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Misc. 35), Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 2.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
33. *Responsibilities of State Departments of Education for School Library Services*. Washington, D.C., Council of Chief State School Officers, 1961, p. 16.
34. Joeckel, *Government of the American Public Library*, p. 50.
35. Eastlick, J. T.: *Sixties and After*. Special Report for Federal Relations Committee, Library Administration Division, American Library Association. Chicago, American Library Association, [1960], p. 4.
36. Ohio. State Library. *Library Laws of Ohio*. Columbus. F. J. Heer Printing Co., 1960, p. 86.
37. Ohio. State Library: *1960 Directory of Ohio Libraries*. Columbus, F. J. Heer Printing Co., 1960, p. 2.
38. Buffalo and Erie County Public Library. *First Annual Report of the Director, 1954*. [n.p., n.d.], p. 8.
39. Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources: *Cooperative Program for the Development of Reference and Research Library Resources in New York State*. Interim Report to James E. Allen, Commissioner of Education. (Mimeographed) November, 1960.
40. Ohio. State Library: *Annual Report, Part One, 1959*. Columbus, F. J. Heer Printing Co., 1960.
41. Missouri. State Library Commission: *Show-me Libraries*, 12:2, March 1961.
42. Joeckel, *Government of the American Public Library*, p. 53.
43. Schenk, Gretchen K.: Creating New Local Service in the United States. *Library Trends*, 4:399-411, April 1956.
44. Moloney, *op. cit.*, p. 4429.
45. Hamill, H. L.: Metropolitan Area and the Library. *Library Quarterly*, 31:13-24, January 1961.
46. Eastlick, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.
47. University Circle Foundation. *Directory of University Circle Libraries*. [Cleveland, 1961].
48. Eastlick, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
49. Bowman, J. R., ed.: *Proceedings of the Second Assembly of State Librarians . . . 1960*. Washington, D.C., Library of Congress, 1961, p. 52.
50. Eastlick, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
51. Leigh, R. D.: Functions of the State Library in Research, Field Studies, and Surveys. *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 53:25-30, Jan. 1959.